

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, March 2, 1998

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COBLE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 2, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable HOWARD COBLE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

For all the gifts of life this day, it is for thanks that we would pray. For spirits strong and hearts aglow, an attitude of thanks to grow.

It is with gratitude we speak. It is with minds and spirits so meek. Of all the trials from which we copy, it is for life and faith we hope.

Without such gifts we would despair, life would flounder, not be fair. So when we speak our words to You, may You, O God, be ever true.

With love and joy we see Your light, in which creation has delight, may we and all Your people here, find thankfulness and daily cheer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. COX of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was commu-

nicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H.R. 2631) "An Act disapproving the cancellations transmitted by the President on October 6, 1997, regarding Public Law 105-45," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House, in which it originated, and passed by the House on reconsideration of the same, it was resolved, that the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senators having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1150) "An Act to ensure that federally funded agricultural research, extension, and education address high-priority concerns with national or multistate significance, to reform, extend, and eliminate certain agricultural research programs, and for other purposes," agrees to a conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LUGAR, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COVERDELL, Mr. HARKIN, and Mr. LEAHY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-83, the Chair announces on behalf of the Majority Leader, his appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the National Council on the Arts—the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-134, the Chair announces on behalf of the Majority Leader, his appointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the Amtrak Reform Council—Gilbert E. Carmichael, of Mississippi, Joseph Vranich, of Pennsylvania, and Paul M. Weyrich, of Virginia.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR JOHN C. STENNIS CENTER FOR PUBLIC SERVICE TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Section 114(b) of Public Law 100-458 (2 U.S.C. 1103), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to

the Board of Trustees for the John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development to fill the existing vacancy thereon, the term to expire on September 27, 1999:

Mr. PICKERING of Mississippi.

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL THOMAS F. RILEY

(Mr. COX of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, today, one of our Nation's great leaders, one of our California leaders will be laid to rest at Arlington National Cemetery. He is a dedicated public servant and a gentleman.

Brigadier General Thomas F. Riley passed away in Orange County on February 19, 1998. He was known to millions of us affectionately as just the General. Tom Riley embodied every virtue that we seek in our public service.

He was born just 2 days after the 4th of July in 1912 in Harrisonburg, Virginia. He received his training as an engineer at Virginia Military Institute. And he went on to serve his country for just one year short of 30 years in the United States Marine Corps.

He worked for another decade in the aerospace industry. Before 1974, President Reagan appointed him to fill out the remaining term of supervisor on the Orange County Board of Supervisors. He served for 30 years, nearly 30 years on the Orange County Board of Supervisors, where he was its chairman. In those years when he was not its chairman, he was always its most important person. He was reelected five times, always by large margins, to preside over what he always called the fabulous 5th District.

General Riley served his community in many ways, not the least of which was his service to his church. He was a Catholic, and he was a member of the Knights of Malta and the Order of the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem.

He was always eager to assist. One of his favorite charities was the Sisters of the Sacred Heart. General Riley helped establish a fashion show known as the Gentleman's Haberdashery, an event that has become a beloved tradition in Orange County.

He was never alone in his efforts. His community was always anxious to serve him and to help him in his service. But most of all at his side for so

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in **this typeface** indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

long, for over 50 years, nearly 60 years, was his wife Emma Jane, who is with us today. She stood with him shoulder to shoulder in all of the hard work, and all the victories, and all the triumphs that he has achieved during a long life.

I know that I speak for all of us in Orange County when I say that our hearts and prayers are with you and your family in this time of your grief. But we must remember that, just as General Riley was not alone in this life, neither will he be in the next.

When he is laid to rest later today in Arlington National Cemetery, he will join the company of other American heroes whose watchwords were always duty, honor, and country. General Tom Riley was one of our heroes in California, and we will never forget him.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

WHITHER THE BUDGET SURPLUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address my colleagues on where I see our country going. I see a country where children come first and where integrity and virtue are honored, indeed, they are recognized and rewarded in American life and to the extent possible through our official government policies; an America where values and character still matter and where the American dream is still real and within reach for those who strive to achieve and succeed.

I believe I speak for most of my colleagues when I say that I want an America where Americans have more personal safety, more financial opportunity and security and more independence and freedom, and that the best way to do that is by lowering taxes, putting an end to judicial activism on the Federal bench, reforming and improving our education system, raising our education standards in this country, and demanding real results from our schools and holding our schools accountable for the performance of their pupils. I also believe that we need to strengthen families and communities in America and that, lastly, we need to restore fairness and morality in American life. So it is those goals and it is that vision that I would like to address today.

I want to begin, though, my remarks under this special order by admitting that I never thought that I would see the day before my House service where

I would be able to take to the House floor and talk about a balanced Federal budget, that I would be able to participate in a debate about the Federal Government actually generating an annual budget surplus as opposed to an annual budget deficit like the deficits that we have run back here in Washington for over a decade. This is all brand new, this whole debate about surplus politics.

Let me first of all, while admitting that balancing the budget and generating a budget surplus presents a new challenge for those of us in positions of elected decision-making responsibility here in Washington, I will just again admit the obvious, what I think most Americans would certainly recognize in their daily lives and in their homes and in their businesses: that we ought not spend the budget surplus before we actually have it in hand. That would be too much like business as usual in Washington. It would be, I think, continuing the very dubious and questionable budget practices of smoke and mirrors.

So let us say for a moment that we are still a ways away from the Federal Government and the Federal budget actually generating a budget surplus. However, this idea, this age of surplus politics does present a very new challenge for us and as the party, the Republican Party, the governing majority party in the Congress, the party of less government and less taxes, we are looking for ways to allow families to keep more of what they earn so that they can decide themselves how best to spend it. It is a very simple, fundamental principle of Republicanism. That is the Republican way.

So as we enter this debate in this new age of surplus politics, we want to make sure that those who earn the money are able to keep more of what they earn and that whenever possible, while fulfilling the primary and fundamental responsibilities of the Federal Government, we return more money from Washington to the people who earn it rather than recycle it through the bureaucracy here and then attempt to find various ways to spend it. The Republican way is again to allow families to keep more of what they earn so that they can decide how best to use that to meet the needs of their family.

The President and congressional Democrats, though, seem to be hostile to that idea. We have been able to, in a way, force the President and force congressional Democrats to go along with the idea of reducing taxes, and we were actually able to pass through this body and get enacted into law with the President's signature a tax cut. But it is clear, particularly if you hear the President's comments today talking about tax simplification, the idea of moving the country in the direction of a simpler, fairer, flatter Tax Code and tax system, perhaps a single rate of

taxation, where we hear the President criticizing that as reckless, then we know that the President continues to resist our efforts to help families and to help our economy.

□ 1415

So, we are now going to be debating here over the next few weeks and months an annual budget resolution. This would be, if you will, the budget blueprint for the Federal Government for the 1998 Federal fiscal year, and as we enter that debate, I believe we ought to be guided by several basic principles.

First of all, the best way to save Social Security is to make sure that we do not spend another dime of the Social Security surplus on more Washington spending, more social programs.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that the President stressed the importance of putting Social Security first when he spoke from this podium right behind me to the Nation and to the Congress in his State of the Nation address back in early February. He talked about the importance, the need of putting Social Security first. But I think we have to kind of somewhat doubt his sincerity when he then, in the next breath, proposes to create a host of new Federal Government programs and to use the budget surplus, as well as the anticipated settlement proceeds, the anticipated proceeds from the large class action tobacco lawsuit, this is the class action litigation that the States have initiated against the big tobacco companies, when the President talks about using the budget surplus and these tobacco lawsuit settlement proceeds, which may or may not materialize, and he talks about using all that money to pay for all of these new Federal Government programs back here in Washington, programs that when added up in the aggregate would cost Federal taxpayers about \$60 to 70 billion more in new Federal Government, Federal taxpayer spending.

We believe the best way to save Social Security is to take Social Security off budget once and forever. No more smoke-and-mirrors budgeting, as I said earlier, no more using the Social Security Trust Fund to mask the true size of the Federal budget deficit and to pay for other Federal Government spending, most of it on social programs.

If we took the Social Security Trust Fund completely off budget, and if we allowed the surplus in that Trust Fund to continue to accrue and to compound interest, we then would be able to offer Americans the opportunity of investing a portion of their own money, their own payroll taxes, in a directed individual retirement account, which would actually earn them a better return than Social Security.

Imagine that, your money. These, of course, are mandatory taxes imposed on you, your FICA contributions, payroll taxes, automatically withheld and

deducted from your paycheck, going into your own individual retirements account, an investment that you select in order to provide you a better return than what Social Security can provide. The difference over the span of your work life, your adult career employment, could be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. The net effect would be more retirement security for all working Americans.

So the best thing we can do with Social Security is take it off budget and, as I said, not use another dime of the Social Security surplus on more Washington spending. To the contrary, use that Social Security surplus to offer or build better retirement security for working Americans.

Secondly, when a legitimate problem needs to be addressed, child care would be an example, we ought to address it by giving families more control and more choice by allowing them to keep more of what they earn. This means cutting taxes. In fact, there are those that are talking about now a targeted tax credit for families with children under the age of 5. The desire, the goal, is to enable families that so choose to have more disposable after-tax income so that at least one spouse can remain in the home and not be forced to work, to be able to provide that all-important nurturing and upbringing that children need.

The President's proposal with respect to child care shows a clear bias towards institutionalized child care and against families that choose to have one spouse remain in the home for child-rearing and child-raising purposes.

So we think a better way to go, rather than spend a lot more money in block grants for child care, rather than continuing to move the Federal Government in the direction of the nanny state, where you have paternalistic big government attempting to address all the needs of families, is to empower families by allowing them to keep more of what they earn, and that, again, means cutting taxes so that families have more money at the end of the day to address their concerns, including child care, which we acknowledge is one of the principal concerns of any family where one or both spouses have to work outside the home, and, therefore, has to depend sometimes or all of the time on reliable, safe, quality child care.

Third, we have to resist pressure from the left, particularly the more liberal wing of the House Democrats, to see the surplus as an excuse to build a bigger and more intrusive Federal Government.

We simply cannot go back to the old ways of spending money on Washington bureaucracies that do not work. You had to wonder when the President gave his State of the Union Address if it was the same President who just 2 years earlier stood at the same spot and had

declared the era of big government over, because for those of us sitting in this chamber, and for those Americans watching and listening across the land, it sounded like the President's State of the Union was a recipe for returning to an era of big government, for expanding government again, basically assuming money that does not exist here today, betting on the if come and maybe, if you will, where the President would propose to pay for all these new programs, again costing in the aggregate somewhere between \$60 and \$70 billion, with a budget surplus we do not yet have in hand, or with the settlement proceeds from this large class action tobacco lawsuit brought by the States against the big tobacco companies.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if that settlement does materialize, and if there are proceeds that are left over after all the attorneys who have some piece of the action are paid off, that that money ought to be used for health care research. We are very committed to biomedical research, particularly trying to find, if you will, a cure to cancer and some of the other chronic diseases and illnesses that plague too many Americans, and it should be used for antitobacco, antidrug initiatives, education and preventive initiatives, if you will, aimed at our young people. Those proceeds should not be used to pay for a whole bunch of Washington programs not even remotely related to medical research or trying to prevent our young people from using tobacco products, or at least trying to educate them as to the damages of using tobacco products.

So, the President has finally agreed to our plan to balance the budget and cut taxes, yet he now appears to have done a 180, and he is attempting, we think, to energize, to galvanize the liberal wing of his party with this budget proposal currently before the Congress. This is really a throwback to the President's first 2 years in office. It is really, if you will, a politics as usual in the model of 1992 and 1993.

The President wants to raise taxes. In his budget proposal, he increases the size and scope of government, and he rejects allowing families to keep more of their own money. Well, it is their money. When we are talking about their children, we are talking about their future as well. So it is their money, their, if you will, lives, their future, and they ought to, American families, be able to keep more of their own money.

So this is just classic vintage politics as usual, and I wanted to come down to the floor and set the record straight about the Clinton budget.

We will have choices to make about the budget surplus, there is no doubt about that, but it is clear we will not follow the prescription that the President sets out in his State of the Union

Address and in his budget proposal to Congress, which is bigger government supported by higher taxes and a Social Security program that would be jeopardized, not saved, by increased spending.

So, let me now talk about where I believe we can help all middle-class working families in this country. I think all of us in this chamber, almost all of us in this chamber, are really concerned that taxes in America are at a record level. They are at a record high, where the average two-income family earned approximately \$54,000 in 1997, last year, but paid more of their income in Federal and State taxes, approximately 38 percent, than they paid for food, clothing, housing and transportation combined; 38 percent as opposed to approximately 34 percent.

So what does that say? It basically says the IRS spends more of your money than you do, and that is wrong, particularly during times of peace and prosperity as we enjoy today. We want to lower the tax burden on working Americans. We believe that the tax burden combined, at all levels of government, Federal, State and local, should not exceed 25 percent during times of peace and prosperity.

As I just mentioned, Federal and State taxes are at 38 percent, more than what families pay today for the necessities of life.

We want to reduce that. Most of us came here to Washington, we campaigned for Congress as fiscal conservatives, and we came here to put our fiscal house in order, to really redefine the role of the Federal Government and to replace big government with smart government.

So the solution, unlike what the President has proposed, is to shrink the government by downsizing at all levels, and to allow the American people to keep more of what they earn. Our responsibility here in the Congress is to reset priorities, if necessary, to establish national priorities. There is no national priority greater, after providing for the collective security through national defense and public safety, there is no priority higher than empowering Americans, particularly those that are economically disadvantaged, by letting them keep more of what they earn.

We feel that your tax dollars should be spent on the things that matter to you, because, after all, it is your money.

So we are talking now about cutting taxes further for the American people, lowering taxes so that Americans have more money, are able to keep more of their own money at the end of the day, and doing something about this onerous tax burden, which is at a record high 38 percent, again, Federal and State taxes, for a median family of four, with Federal taxes accounting for about 21 to 22 percent, the highest level

of Federal taxation in our country's history.

So where could we begin to lower taxes? I think the best way to lower taxes is to raise the income threshold at which the 28 percent tax bracket would apply; in essence, putting more people in the 15 percent, the lowest tax bracket. That would be a tax break for every single taxpayer, except for those already in the lowest bracket, and for those folks, to help reduce their taxes, our plan would raise the personal exemption from 27- to \$3,400 per year, so that more of the lowest-income earners would pay no taxes at all.

It is a bottom up approach, if you will, to tax relief in America that can and will lift all boats. It is one that those who serve in the Congress now, those who talk about targeted tax relief, and that includes, of course, the President, it is one that they would have a hard time attacking, because these are the people, the practitioners of what I call class warfare and the politics of envy. They believe in confiscating wealth and redistributing that wealth, and I think that approach is not only flawed, but failed. It has not worked in the former Communist bloc in Eastern Europe, and it will not work in America, because it is inherently anti-American.

□ 1430

So what we want to do is cut taxes, but on terms that Members of Congress ought to be able to support on a bipartisan basis.

Let me just tell the Members, as for paying for these tax cuts, because we have a very real fiscal discipline in Washington nowadays, it is called "pay as you go," where you have to find a corresponding offset. You have to find a way, if you will, of paying for lowering taxes. So as for paying for these tax cuts, if the President has more money to spend, we have the money to cut taxes in Washington. There is no question about it.

So we need to reduce spending, we need to reduce taxes, and we need to save Social Security. That is why I favor the idea of letting every American taxpayer, beginning now, this year, choose between paying a flat tax on their income or staying in the current system. We do not need to study the flat tax or the whole concept of tax simplification indefinitely.

That is the Washington way, to study things to death. It is called paralysis by analysis. Instead, we could now begin giving taxpayers that choice, that option of reporting their income and paying a flat tax on that income or staying in the current system. Like I said earlier, we could now, if we take the Social Security trust fund off budget, start allowing working Americans the opportunity to invest a portion of their payroll taxes in a directed individual retirement account so they can

earn a better return than what Social Security provides.

This would create a retirement program that protects current retirees, protects seniors, older Americans, and at the same time offers opportunity to young workers. The combination of allowing taxpayers to choose a flat tax, on the one hand, and to invest a portion of their own payroll taxes in their own individual retirement account, as opposed to Social Security, the combination of those two ideas would not only empower millions of Americans, but it would lead to more take-home pay and more retirement security in America today.

So I wanted to share those two ideas with my colleagues today. I talked about a vision of a country where there is more personal safety, more freedom, and more opportunity.

I am also working very hard for passage of legislation that would impose term limits on Federal judges who are currently appointed for life. Think about that for a moment. We have too many judges who are activist judges, pursuing a political agenda as opposed to strictly interpreting and enforcing the law. What really makes that, I think, particularly troublesome is the fact that so many of those judges have lifetime appointments to the Federal bench. They are appointed for life and therefore they are not accountable to we, the people.

My bill which I have introduced for consideration by my colleagues would apply term limits or impose term limits on Federal judges, because it would require the periodic renomination and reconfirmation of all Federal judges. So the net effect would be no more lifetime tenure for unaccountable judges who too often pursue, as I said earlier, an activist political agenda.

We have been particularly hard hit by that in California, where California voters have voted overwhelmingly for Proposition 187, a statewide initiative, a ballot referendum, if you will, that addresses illegal immigration, and more recently, the California civil rights initiative, Proposition 209 on the California ballot, which would eliminate affirmative action preferences in California law.

In both instances, opponents of those ballot initiatives were immediately able to go to Federal court and find a friendly, sympathetic judge who, in effect, delayed the implementation of those two ballot initiatives which had the effect of subverting the will of a majority of California voters. Think about that; one person on the Federal bench who can effectively block the will of millions of voters, a majority of the electorate. That is wrong, and that is why we need term limits for Federal judges.

I also believe, if we are truly committed to public safety in this country, that we will end lenient release and pa-

role standards. We have a huge problem in this country today. It is particularly acute in California where many people, arrested and charged with serious crimes, are released right back out on the streets. In fact, many times they are back out on the streets before the arresting officer can get back out on the street, because arresting officers have to, and I know this as a former police officer and deputy sheriff myself, they have to complete the required paperwork.

So we have lots of people who are being released right back out into society in California today and in other States around the country because of these very lenient release practices. It is called OR, releasing somebody on their own recognizance and their promise to appear at a later date in court to stand trial on those charges.

We know what happens. Too often those individuals commit other crimes, additional crimes, while they are free on their own recognizance, or they fail to appear to stand trial on the charges, which is a crime in itself. Then they become fugitives from justice, in many, many cases, avoiding justice for years and years and years, or avoiding justice indefinitely.

We need to end those lenient release standards in our jails. The best way to do that is to require bail, not jail, for those people who have been arrested and charged with serious crimes. That bail requirement, the idea of a surety bond or a bail bond, is the best way to assure that that person will appear at that later date to stand trial on the charges and will be less likely to commit additional crimes while they are free in society if they are able to post bail.

We also have to eliminate lenient parole standards in American society. I think most Americans believe that when someone is convicted of a crime that the time they are given should be the time that they serve, but too often time given is not time served. The average sentence imposed in America today for murder, the taking of another human life, is roughly 15 years. Yet, the average sentence actually served for someone who has been convicted of murder is 5 years, 6 months. I do not believe that 15 years should mean 5 years, 6 months.

So we need to end lenient release standards, and we need tough sentencing and parole standards. We have to make sure, again, that those who are arrested and charged with serious crimes get jail, not bail; that they go to jail, that they are not released right back into society, and we have to make sure that the time given is time served.

If we are truly concerned, though, about public safety, certainly in California, we have to seal off our border from drugs and illegal immigration. We have about 6,600 jail beds or jail cells in America today, and about a half a million, a half million, illegal aliens,

many of whom commit other crimes while in America; bearing in mind, of course, that coming here, crossing the border, entering America illegally, is a crime in itself, and they then commit other crimes while living in America.

So 6,600 jail beds, and one-half million, approximately, or estimated, illegal aliens in America. We obviously have no way to control the problem. We obviously have no way to incarcerate those individuals. Too many of those individuals are filling up our jails, are occupying our available jail cells, and as a result, we are not able to incarcerate, pretrial, many of the people who should remain in jail, not free on their own recognizance or promise to appear in court, because they pose a very serious risk, a real menace, if you will, to society as a whole.

We also should change Federal policy in this country where criminal aliens, aliens who are arrested and convicted of serious crimes in America, I am talking about illegal aliens, are deported back to their country of origin. Because again, our concern is we do not have enough jail cells, we do not have enough prison cells to ensure the public safety, and to protect the public from those individuals who have shown as a result of their criminal history that they pose a very real risk to society as a whole.

Lastly, if we are concerned about public safety, since children account for the fastest growing segment of the criminal population, we ought to pass legislation in this session of Congress, which is rapidly running down now, that deals with the juvenile crime problem in America.

I am the author of H.R. 1818, that passed the House of Representatives by a strong and in effect an overwhelming bipartisan vote, that is now languishing in the other body. It is languishing in the Senate. We should not let the other body be the graveyard for legislation that deals with juvenile crime and delinquency prevention. I like my bill, which is tough on punishment but smart on prevention.

The bottom line is we have to be willing to do what it takes to save our children from drugs, violence, and failing schools. We cannot as a country afford to lose another generation of urban schoolchildren. We have to invest in education, job skills, and stronger families and communities, and our policy should be directed there, because there is never going to be any way we can build enough jail or prison cells to house the entire criminal population.

If we do not address this growing crime problem on the part of young people who lack the education and the job skills to find gainful employment and to live a productive and successful adult life, it is a perfectly real problem in this country and it is one that continues to grow with every passing day.

We do have a gap in American society, a gap between the haves and the have nots, or the have little. That gap is defined more by your education and your job skills than by your financial status or your material wealth, particularly with respect to young people. So there is a clear need to improve our education system in America today, and that is why at the beginning of this Congress I accepted the responsibility of chairing the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families of the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the House of Representatives.

I truly believe that every American child has the inalienable right to a high-quality, world class, if you will, education. For those who talk a lot about affirmative action, even though I believe as we enter the 21st century we ought to be moving into the post-affirmative action era, where a person is judged, as Dr. King suggested, by the content of their character rather than the color of their skin, but if you believe in affirmative action, as so many people in the Congress espouse, then I think you have to say, okay, affirmative action really means equal opportunity, and equal opportunity begins in our schools.

There is a great American tradition of a free public education for every child. That is the common denominator. That is where equal opportunity begins in American society, not equal outcome. It is equal opportunity. The assumption is that as an American, if you get the education and skills through our public education system, then you are ready. You are at the starting line, and where you end up in the race of life, if you will, is then up to you. It is a matter of personal initiative and discipline and effort.

But too many of our children are not getting that education today. They are not getting the education they need to be productive citizens. What are we trying to do to improve our education system? For the last year and a half I, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families, have focused a lot on improving the quality of teaching, because we need good teachers.

There are few professions, few occupations, more important than the teaching profession. It is truly a missionary calling, and there is a saying that a teacher can affect eternity, because he or she never knows where their influence on that child might end. So we need to improve education through good teachers, through a traditional curriculum in our schools focusing on the basics, the core academic subjects, by ensuring that every child has access to and instruction in technology, and lastly, by holding our schools accountable. I am going to have more to say about that in just a moment.

We have also worked for the last year and a half, and I am talking, now, about the majority party, the Republican Party in the Congress, not only forming an education task force, but crafting a legislative agenda that makes sure that education dollars, your taxpayer dollars for Federal education programs, are spent on teachers and on students and on classrooms, not on more bureaucracy here in Washington or at the State government level.

We want 90 cents, 90 cents minimum, that is the minimum, the goal actually is 95 cents, of every Federal taxpayer dollar for education to go down to the classroom level, ideally, to pay someone who knows that child's name. That is our goal. We are working steadily, making sure of progress, gradual progress, in driving more money down to the local level and trying to make sure that that money then follows the child. It is the child-centered approach to education funding.

We are also working for more local control and more accountability through competition and choice. We have bipartisan legislation that has passed, again, the House of Representatives, it is pending across the way in the Capitol, in the other body, the Senate, that would create more independent public schools, known as charter schools.

These are deregulated public schools that are free of a lot of the bureaucracy and red tape that strangles our schools today. Those schools obviously are a lot freer, a lot more able to experiment and to innovate in education today. Charter schools in the public schools are the best way to ensure local control and local decision-making.

□ 1445

They are truly autonomous. We respect this tradition in America today of local control where that locally elected school board is responsible for making education policy decisions, from curriculum to personnel and everything else.

But with charter schools, we drive that control and that accountability down one step further, to the lowest possible level, which is that individual school site. And that is what we want in education today. We want site-based decision-making. We want local control at the individual school. That is what we are doing by helping to create more charter schools around the country; charter schools which, by the way, are the first step on the road to full parental choice in education.

Full parental choice is ultimately the best way to assure accountability in education today, that we ought to, as a matter of national policy, allow parents the right to choose the education and the schooling that is appropriate for their child. To do that, we

have to let them choose among all possibilities, all options in that local community. We have to give them the full range of choice among all competing institutions, public, private, and parochial.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to do that at the Federal level by pursuing legislation that would give parents tuition tax credits. We are pursuing tuition scholarships, which are also called opportunity scholarships or vouchers, for low-income families who too often do not have the same array, the same range of choice that more affluent families have and whose children too often are trapped in failing, underperforming and even unsafe schools.

We are trying to pursue education saving accounts where parents can invest their own hard-earned, after-tax dollars in an education savings account, a little bit like an individual retirement account, and then make tax-free withdrawals to pay for education of any kind in primary and secondary schools, in other words for grades K through 12, for their children, and that would include private school tuition.

We have literacy legislation, and the main thrust of the literacy legislation is to give parents what is called tuition assistance grants if their children are not reading at or above grade level. If their children are falling behind their peers, if that school cannot get that child up to grade level in terms of their reading skills, then we provide a tuition assistance grant for that family which can be used at other reading tutors or those kinds of companies or services in the local level.

Our belief is that every child should be able to read and write by the end of the first grade. The first grade, Mr. Speaker. We hear people in this Chamber and elsewhere in Washington talking about every child being able to read and write well in English by the end of the third or fourth grade. We believe that every child should be able to read and write by the end of the first grade in English, which is the official, it is the common and, yes, it is the commercial language of our country.

So we are very, very committed to improving the quality of education in America today. We are also cognizant that there is a problem with bilingual education in America today; that too many children are placed in bilingual education classes and that seems to compound some of their learning difficulties. They seem to lag even further behind their peers. So we want to change Federal policy, Federal law, with respect to bilingual education so that parents must give their consent, must give their written permission before their child can be placed in a bilingual education class. We are working hard on legislation that would do that now.

But when we talk about our children, we have to ask the question: Do we

really care for our children? Do we demonstrate by our own personal action, and I am talking now not just to my colleagues but to all adults, we are role models for our children. Do we really care for our children and do we teach our kids the right lessons?

Mr. Speaker, I personally believe that there is nothing more important than personal morality in life; that the truth matters and character does count. I worry that with recent events here in Washington, we send a very different, almost opposite, opposing message to our children today.

Many of the problems that plague our Nation today arise primarily from bad moral decisions that have been made by adults. Illegitimacy, crime, drugs, a divorce rate that is way too high, drug abuse, child abuse and neglect, pornography, a rate of abortion in America that is way too high. I believe that the most pressing issue affecting child welfare is the breakdown of the family. That is why I mentioned at the beginning of my comments the need to try to help build stronger families and stronger communities.

Mr. Speaker, I also mentioned at the beginning of my comments that we have balanced the budget, or are on the verge of balancing our budget, which was a goal that I and many of my colleagues had when we were first elected to Congress. But I really believe that being on the verge of eliminating the fiscal deficit in America today, we need to address the moral deficit in America today. We have to address the spiritual state of the Union, which is our real national product.

That begins, for those of us in positions of elective office, with the responsibility of being good role models for our children. Politicians and elected officials, and I know that this goes contrary to the grain, counter to the grain, contrary to conventional wisdom in America today that holds out a very cynical belief and there is disdain for the political process and for those of us who hold political office. I really believe that politicians and elected officials should be held to higher standards, whether we like it or not.

Mr. Speaker, I speak now in a very personal sense to some of my colleagues in Federal Government today from the very top on down. Politicians should be held to higher standards because we are and should be role models for our kids.

So I wanted to stress that in my remarks today. I will have more to say on that subject over the next few days. I am constrained, I am told, by the rules of this body, the rules of this House, from commenting on the President's conduct and personal character. But I do hope that I will be able to find a way to address the controversy here in Washington which I worry is setting the wrong example and sending the worst possible message to our young people today.

Speaking of the moral erosion of American society, I also wanted to share with my colleagues some comments that were made by one of our former colleagues, former California Congressman Dan Lungren, who is the Attorney General of California today. He has been speaking out a lot about the future of our country and the importance of morality and restoring morality in American life. He has been addressing the moral erosion and the neglect of virtues in America today.

Mr. Speaker, I think his words and some of the things that he has written really bear a great deal of merit, thought, reflection and consideration by this body here. I want to share very quickly a column that appeared in the Los Angeles Times talking about former Congressman and now California Attorney General Dan Lungren. I will read from the column. It says, "Attorney General Dan Lungren may be behind the times, his values stuck in a bygone era."

Mr. Speaker, let me digress for a moment just to say that if he is stuck in that bygone era, I guess I am there and I know many other people may be as well. The column goes on to say:

He may be ahead of the times, far in front of some moral pendulum. But polls indicate he is not with the times. Lungren has this unconventional notion that character and virtue are important in a person's public and private life. He doesn't understand how the two can be separated.

The article quotes him as saying,

I don't compartmentalize my life. I don't think most people do. To suggest you can be honest in one significant part of your life and dishonest in another, and that one side never affects the other, I don't find it possible. And if Americans really don't understand that, we are in for a sad state of affairs. Because we will not have enough cops, enough prosecutors, enough prisons to take care of our young people if, in fact, they believe that character does not count. That if you can get away with it, it's okay.

That is what I worry about. I worry that we are now teaching our young people that somehow the truth is disposable. That in the political fray, the give and take back here in Washington, that the truth is something to be distorted and manipulated for partisan advantage. And, again, that is the worst possible message we can be sending to our children about the importance of personal morality and character and about the way our political process works.

The column goes on to say that Attorney General Lungren has been talking about morality for a long time. So have some of the rest of us. It reminds me of the old country song, "I was country when country wasn't cool." A lot of us were talking about morality and character and talking about stressing the need to talk more about character and virtue for a long time now. We were doing that not only because we have to be role models for our children as elected decision-makers, but

because we think there is a tremendous yearning for spiritual values now in America, as this column suggests, that is unarticulated and unfulfilled. And, hence, here I am today in what is really sort of an "off" day for the Congress talking about these particular issues.

It just, I think, cannot be stressed enough that we should have a public debate on character, especially the character of politicians, and that those of us who are in elective office should welcome that debate and the scrutiny that comes with it.

Two weeks ago we celebrated President's Day, the day that is created to celebrate the birthdays of Presidents George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Two weeks ago today. It is a day when the country honors two great men who led this country at unique times. I certainly would not put myself in the same category as Washington and Lincoln, but it is their qualities of leadership and strength of character that I believe every person running for elective office should try to emulate.

First and foremost, both men were men of great integrity and fortitude. Secondly, both men were willing to do the right thing for their country regardless of the political consequences. If we think about that for a moment, perhaps like I do, my colleagues will realize that times have indeed changed. These were men, by the way, long before the advent of modern American politics where everything is polled and focus-grouped, and where we can have political operatives and handlers and advisors and everybody is out there spinning constantly. This was long, long before that. Both men, though, stood for what they believed was right. They stood for doing the right thing for their country, for their constituencies, regardless of consequences.

Washington said, "Let prejudices in local interest yield to reason. Let us look to our national character and to things beyond the present period." That is, I think, very timely advice for today. Washington said, "Let us look to our national character and to things beyond the present period."

Abraham Lincoln, in his last public address in April of 1865, said, "Important principles may and must be inflexible." Both men believed in being patriotic citizens first and politicians second. It is called, very simply, principle over politics. Both men triumphed over adversity and numerous setbacks. The value of courage, persistence and perseverance has rarely been illustrated more convincingly than in the life story of these men, and both men recognized that their perseverance was a gift of God.

Both men realized, again, as I said earlier, that the truth matters and character counts. They understood the importance of morality in American life. They understood that our freedom, the foundation of this country, was

built on our Judeo-Christian values, and that it would never be possible or desirable to separate those values from the official actions and policies of our government.

□ 1500

George Washington said, in his Farewell Address, of all the dispositions and habits which leads to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who would subvert these great pillars of human happiness.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor today to talk about building a better America for our children, about leading the country to a new level of freedom and opportunity for every citizen, about repairing and rebuilding the moral fabric of America, and about my concern for the lessons we teach our children, the message that we send our children if, in fact, we really do care for our children when we begin to become very subjective, very relative about the truth and about morality in American life.

Washington and Lincoln again reminded us that there is no substitute for character and morality in elective office, and there is no shortcut for the truth. Today, 2 weeks after the President's Day holiday to celebrate their birthdays, I thought it would be a good idea to come to the floor and remind my colleagues that we can learn from the lessons of Washington and Lincoln, that we can, by following their example, do the right thing and put principle over politics.

1998 TRADE POLICY AGENDA AND 1997 ANNUAL REPORT ON TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2213), I transmit herewith the 1998 Trade Policy Agenda and 1997 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 1998.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIGGS) to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIGGS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, on March 4.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, on March 4.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCINTOSH.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. BARCIA.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RIGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. BERMAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 3, 1998, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7619. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazelnuts Grown in Oregon and Washington; Reduced Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV97-982-1 FIR] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7620. A letter from the Administrator, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Removal of Sunday Packing and Loading Prohibitions [Docket No. FV98-959-2 IFR] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7621. A letter from the Administrator, Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procurement of Processed Agricultural Commodities for Donation Under Title II, Pub. L. 480 (RIN: 0560-AF09), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7622. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of

Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 1998–99 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV98-985-1FR] received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7623. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Myclobutanil; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300620; FRL-5772-8] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7624. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Hydramethylnon; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300606; FRL-5767-1] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7625. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pendimethalin; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300621; FRL-5772-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7626. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS); TRICARE Program; Nonavailability Statement Requirements [Docket No. 0720-AA35] received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

7627. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS); TRICARE Prime Balance Billing [RIN: 0720-AA46] received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

7628. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting renotification of the proposed obligation of \$4 million in certain FY 1994 and FY 1995 funds to implement the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, pursuant to Public Law 104-106, section 1205; to the Committee on National Security.

7629. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 97F-0375] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7630. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pesticides; FFDCA Jurisdiction over Food Packaging Impregnated with an Insect Repellent Transferred to FDA [OPP-300605; FRL-5766-9] (RIN: 2070-AD20) received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7631. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amends its

Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Brodhead, Kentucky) [Docket No. 96-202] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7632. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Table of Allotments; FM Broadcast Stations (Ocean Shores, Washington) [Docket No. 97-50] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7633. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (New Albany, Mississippi) [Docket No. 97-230RM-9185] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7634. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Payson, Arizona) [Docket No. 97-125 RM-9058] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7635. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Coarsegold, California) [Docket No. 97-209 RM-9152] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7636. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Farmersburg, Indiana) [Docket No. 97-202 RM-9129] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7637. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of the Commission's Rules Concerning Maritime Communications [PR Docket No. 92-257 RM-7956, 8031, 8352] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7638. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Baron and Rice Lake, Wisconsin) [MM Docket No. 96-15 RM-8748 RM-8798] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7639. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Negaunee, Michigan) [MM Docket No. 96-137 RM-8823] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7640. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Boonville,

Missouri) [MM Docket No. 96-229 RM-8919] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7641. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Radio Broadcasting Services; San Angelo, Texas [MM Docket No. 95-150, RM-8692] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7642. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Monroe, Utah) [MM Docket No. 97-224 RM-9177] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7643. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 07-98 requesting final approval for a memorandum of understanding between the U.S. and the United Kingdom for certain research and development projects, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

7644. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Management and Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7645. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

7646. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Habitat Conservation Plan Assurances ("No Surprises") Rule [Docket No. 980212035-8035-01] (RIN: 1018-AE24) received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7647. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Permits; Establishment of a Depredation Order for the Double-Crested Cormorant (RIN: 1018-AE11) received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7648. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 50 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-275-AD; Amendment 39-10202; AD 97-21-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7649. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 97-ANE-07; Amendment 39-10135; AD 97-19-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7650. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9 Series Airplanes and C-9 (Military) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96-NM-95-AD; Amendment 39-10176; AD 97-22-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64)

received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7651. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation Model S-61A, D, E, L, N, NM, R, and V Helicopters [Docket No. 97-SW-18-AD; Amendment 39-10026; AD 97-19-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7652. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft, Inc. SA226 and SA227 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-CE-90-AD; Amendment 39-10188; AD 97-23-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7653. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98-NM-04-AD; Amendment 39-10362; AD 98-02-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7654. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS 332L2 Helicopters [Docket No. 97-SW-29-AD; Amendment 39-10359; AD 98-04-48] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7655. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-04-AD; Amendment 39-10351; AD 98-04-39] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7656. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revocation and Establishment of Class C Airspace Areas; Cedar Rapids, IA [RIN: 2120-AA66] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7657. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Poplar, Mt; and Revision of Class E Airspace; Wolf Point, MT [Airspace Docket No. 97-ANM-04] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7658. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D Airspace; Twin Falls, ID [Airspace Docket No. 97-ANM-24] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7659. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Hayden, CO [Airspace Docket No. 97-ANM-13] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7660. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Connecticut River, CT [RIN: 2115-AE47] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7661. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regulated Navigation Area Regulation: Ice Operations in Chesapeake Bay [Docket No. CGD 05-98-004] (RIN: 2115-AE84) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7662. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Mission Bay, San Diego, CA; Oceanside Harbor, Oceanside, CA [Docket San Diego, 98-006] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7663. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Critical Ship Safety Systems Table and Components of a Supplement under the Alternate Compliance Program [Docket No. USCG 98-3324] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7664. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Coast Guard Acceptance of Resiliently Seated Valves [Docket No. USCG 1998-3560] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7665. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passenger Manifest Information [Docket No. OST-95-950] (RIN: 2105-AB78) received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7666. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Big Piney, WY [Airspace Docket No. 97-ANM-14] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7667. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Election in respect of losses attributable to a disaster [26 CFR 1.165-11] received February 27, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7668. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claims for refund, credits or abatement; determination of correct tax liability (Also Part I, Section 6001; 1.6001-1) [Docket No. 26 CFR 601.105] received February 26, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3130. A bill to provide for an alternative penalty procedure for States that

fail to meet Federal child support data processing requirements, to reform Federal incentive payments for effective child support performance, and to provide for a more flexible penalty procedure for States that violate interjurisdictional adoption requirements; with an amendment (Rept. 105-422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GILMAN: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 1432. A bill to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa; with an amendment (Rept. 105-423 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1432. A bill to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Saharan Africa; with an amendment (Rept. 105-423 Pt. 2).

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Banking and Financial Services discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1432 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1432. Referral to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services extended for a period ending not later than March 2, 1998.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3301. A bill to amend chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of the Treasury greater discretion with regard to the placement of the required inscriptions on quarter dollars issued under the 50 States Commemorative Coin Program; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H.R. 3302. A bill to amend the Reclamation States Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1991 to provide a loan to the Madera-Chowchilla Power Authority; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida):

H. Res. 374. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the ongoing violence in Algeria; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H. Res. 375. A resolution supporting the efforts of Dobroslav Paraga to bring about increased respect for democratic and human rights in Croatia; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 859: Mr. REDMOND.
H.R. 902: Mr. BRADY.

H.R. 1054: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. GOODLING.
H.R. 1372: Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 1401: Mr. OLVER and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1841: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2004: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 2052: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 2351: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 2545: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2568: Mr. POMBO.
H.R. 2593: Mr. FROST, Mr. PITTS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. JONES, and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 2639: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2788: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2803: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. TALENT.
H.R. 3147: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 3166: Mr. HULSHOF.
H.R. 3270: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 3291: Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. METCALF.
H.J. Res. 102: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BOYD, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KLECZKA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. SABO, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BOB SCHAFER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. WALSH.
H. Con. Res. 122: Mr. ACKERMAN.